

## REMARKS

### I. Status of the Application

Claims 18-37 are pending in this application. In the February 1, 2008 final office action, the Examiner:

A. Rejected claims 18-20, 22-28 and 30-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,842,224 to Fenner et al. (hereinafter, "Fenner");

B. Rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenner in view of US 6,026,198 to Okada et al.; and

C. Rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenner and further in view of US 6,094,431 to Yamato et al.

In the Advisory Action of April 30, 2008, the Examiner continued to reject claims 18-37, alleging that they do not overcome the above-listed references. In this response, applicants have amended claims 18, 30, 31 and 36. Applicants have also cancelled claim 19. Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's rejection and request reconsideration of claims 18 and 20-37 in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### II. The Rejection of Independent Claims 18, 30 and 36 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Should Be Withdrawn

In the February 1, 2008 final office action, the examiner rejected claims 18, 30 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fenner. As provided in MPEP § 2131, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either

expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). In addition, the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

A. Claim 18

The Fenner reference does not disclose all the limitations of amended claims 18, 30 and 36. For example, the Fenner reference does not disclose the limitation of “comparing the compressed destination address identifier with forwarding addresses available for routing, which forwarding addresses have been compressed using the compression algorithm and stored as entries of a routing table” as set forth in claim 18. Similar limitations are also found in amended independent claims 30 and 36.

In the advisory action, the Examiner refers to column 23 lines 45 - 48 and column 24 lines 25 - 27 of Fenner as disclosing the foregoing “comparing” limitation. Apparently, the Examiner considers these passages to disclose a comparison of a compressed destination address identifier with an entry of a routing table. However, applicant respectfully disagrees. The passages cited by the examiner clearly state that a key is supplied to an arithmetic computation logic in order to compute a record index. The record index is a data value that is used as a logical address to place within the key record memory in which the record corresponding to the key is stored. That is to say, a record index is computed from the key

and is used to directly address the memory location in which the record corresponding to the key is stored.

The above operation as explained in Fenner does not involve a comparison of the record index to another entity. In particular, the record index is not compared to entries of the routing table, i.e., to contents of the memory. Further, it is not mentioned in Fenner that the record memory is used to store entries which are compressed forwarding addresses available for routing and are suitable to be compared with the record index as described in Fenner.

Furthermore, the process of addressing a memory location as described in Fenner does not correspond to a comparison of a memory address with another entity. Rather, the process of addressing a memory location typically involves generating control signals for memory elements on the basis of a memory address, without requiring that the memory address is compared to another entity. This is also explained in Fenner, column 24, lines 2 – 11, specifying that the record index is presented on address lines in order to access a record associated with the key (see also reference numerals 74' and 517 in Fig. 5). In any case, when addressing a memory location, the memory address will not be compared to contents of the memory.

Accordingly, the process of addressing a memory location on the basis of the record index as described in Fenner does not correspond to comparing compressed destination address identifiers with compressed forwarding addresses available for routing, which are stored as entries in the routing table, i.e., constitute contents of the routing table.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all the limitations of claim 18 are not disclosed by Fenner. Other distinctions also exist between Fenner and claim 18, such as

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all the limitations of claim 18 are not disclosed by Fenner. Other distinctions also exist between Fenner and claim 18, such as those outlined in the Response to Final Office Action of April 1, 2008. Those arguments are reasserted herein and incorporated by reference. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the examiner's rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

B. Claim 30

In the February 1, 2008 final office action, claim 30 was rejected as being anticipated by Fenner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). However, claim 30 includes limitations not found in Fenner. For example, claim 30 includes the limitation of "a routing unit configured to compare the compressed destination address identifier with the compressed forwarding addresses stored in the routing table store so as to find a correspondence between the compressed destination address identifier and one of the entries of the routing table store." Thus, claim 30 includes limitations similar to those found in claim 18. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as those set forth above in connection with claim 18, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should also be withdrawn.

D. Claim 36

In the February 1, 2008 final office action, claim 36 was rejected as being anticipated by Fenner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). However, claim 36 includes limitations not found in Fenner. For example, claim 36 includes the limitation of "second data compression means are provided for compressing the forwarding addresses according to said data compression

algorithm and storing the compressed forwarding addresses as entries in the routing table storing means, the routing unit being configured such that it compares the compressed destination address identifier with the compressed forwarding addresses stored in the routing table storing means.” Thus, claim 36 includes limitations similar to those found in claim 18. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as those set forth above in connection with claim 18, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should also be withdrawn.

### III. The Rejection of Dependent Claims 20-29, 31-35 and 37 Should Be Withdrawn

Dependent claims 20-29, 31-35, and 37 all depend from and incorporate all the limitations of one of allowable independent claims 18, 30, or 36. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 20-29, 31-35, and 37 are also allowable for at least the same reasons the independent claims 18, 30, or 36 are allowable, and the examiner’s rejection of dependent claims 20-29, 31-35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Russ Fowler", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Russell E. Fowler II  
Attorney for Applicants  
Attorney Registration No. 43,615  
Maginot Moore & Beck  
Chase Tower  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109  
Telephone: (317) 638-2922